

## R E M A R K S

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application.

Claims 12 and 13 have been newly added. The claims are fully supported by the specification for example page 14, lines 11-25.

Claim 7 is objected to for antecedent basis for "said second routing unit". Claim 7 is amended to correctly recite this second routing unit.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Engel, et al. (Engel) in view of DePrycker, et al (DePrycker). Claim 3 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Engel, in view of Kikinis (U.S. 6,289,389).

Applicant's claimed invention is different from the combination of cited reference because the restricting the maximum length of the data packet to the predetermined limit value of claims 1 and 8 refers to changing a maximum length of each of the data packets to a predetermined limit value and routing the data packets and voice packets that were restricted (divided) to the Internet network while restricting the maximum length of the data packet to the predetermined limit value.

This is described in applicant's specification for example, page 14, lines 11-25 and page 18 starting line 7: "Accordingly, the data packet fragmentation circuit 72, when the data packet DTP or the voice packet AUP is inputted from the LAN interface circuit 71, judges whether or not the packet length thereof exceed the first set value. If over the first set value, the data packet fragmentation circuit 72 fragments this packet to the fragmentation length indicated by the first set value."

This feature is neither suggested nor disclosed by the combination of cited references.

Further none of the three references teaches the combined features of the first routing unit.

Engel discloses Internet Telephony (column 1, lines 41-43), and describes a network server 170, for example, col. 6, lines 55-67. Clearly this description limits this network server 170 to "any of the following:..." Engel teaches the network server utilizes packet control mechanisms for example, if the server realizes that the bandwidth constraints have disappeared, (e.g. the client has terminated a voice over IP call with a peer) the rules pertaining to the client can be deleted using a trigger event (column 18, lines 59-64).

The Office Action recognizes that Engel does not expressly disclose having a packet-assembling unit assemble a control packet to be sent to the router to inform it to restrict packets that are over a certain length.

The Office Action refers to DePrycker, and argues that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the network server send an information packet to the first router to notify it not to pass through any packets over a certain length, instead of having the server do all of these functions itself.

However, as pointed out above, applicant's restricting the maximum length of the data packet to the predetermined limit value is not relating to whether or not the routing passes through any packets over a certain length. Applicant's claim relates to fragmenting or dividing the data packet to the predetermined limit value.

For example, the present invention is characterized by routing, when receiving the control packet containing the indication information for changing a maximum length of each of the data packets to a predetermined limit value, data packets and voice packets that were restricted

(divided) to the Internet network while restricting the maximum length of the data packet to the predetermined limit value.

In contrast to the recited “notifying it not to pass through any packets over a certain length.” Applicant claims “while restricting the maximum length of the data packet to the predetermined limit value”.

It is respectfully submitted applicant’s claims 1 and 8 recite distinguishing features not suggested nor disclosed in the combination of cited Engel in view of DePrycker. Further the reference Kikinis fails to teach the restricting the length of a data packet and does not suggest routing via the Internet. Applicant’s dependent claims are likewise in condition for allowance for at least the foregoing reasons and because the each recite additional features.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian S. Myers  
Reg. No. 46,947

**CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304**

Katten Muchin Zavis Rosenman  
575 Madison Avenue  
New York, NY 10022-2585  
(212) 940-8703  
Docket No.: FUJY 17.159 (100794-11370)  
BSM:fd